

Doyle	Kind	Portman	Whitfield	Wolf	Young (AK)
Dreier	King (IA)	Price (NC)	Wicker	Woolsey	Young (FL)
Duncan	King (NY)	Pryce (OH)	Wilson (NM)	Wu	
Dunn	Kingston	Putnam	Wilson (SC)	Wynn	
Edwards	Kirk				
Ehlers	Kline	Radanovich			
Emanuel	Knollenberg	Rahall			
Emerson	Kolbe	Ramstad	Doggett	McDermott	Stenholm
Engel	LaHood	Rangel	Hill	Mollohan	Taylor (MS)
English	Lampson	Regula	Kanjorski	Murtha	Tierney
Eshoo	Langevin	Rehberg	Klecza	Pascrell	
Etheridge	Lantos	Renzi	Kucinich	Stark	
Evans	Larsen (WA)	Reyes			
Everett	Larson (CT)	Reynolds			
Farr	Latham	Rodriguez	Berry	Gephardt	Rush
Fattah	LaTourette	Rogers (AL)	Blumenauer	McIntyre	Stearns
Feeney	Leach	Rogers (KY)	Cubin	Miller (FL)	Thompson (CA)
Ferguson	Lee	Rogers (MI)	DeFazio	Platts	
Filner	Levin	Ros-Lehtinen	Forbes	Rohrabacher	
Flake	Lewis (CA)	Ross			
Fletcher	Lewis (GA)	Rothman			
Foley	Lewis (KY)	Roybal-Allard			
Ford	Linder	Royce			
Fossella	Lipinski	Ruppersberger			
Frank (MA)	LoBiondo	Ryan (OH)			
Franks (AZ)	Lofgren	Ryan (WI)			
Frelinghuysen	Lowe	Ryun (KS)			
Frost	Lucas (KY)	Sabo			
Gallegly	Lucas (OK)	Sanchez, Linda T.			
Garrett (NJ)	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta			
Gerlach	Majette	Sanders			
Gibbons	Maloney	Sandlin			
Gilchrest	Manzullo	Saxton			
Gillmor	Markey	Schakowsky			
Gingrey	Marshall	Schiff			
Gonzalez	Matheson	Schrock			
Goode	Matsui	Scott (GA)			
Goodlatte	McCarthy (MO)	Scott (VA)			
Gordon	McCarthy (NY)	Sensenbrenner			
Goss	McCollum	Serrano			
Granger	McCotter	Sessions			
Graves	McCrery	Shadegg			
Green (TX)	McGovern	Shaw			
Green (WI)	McHugh	Shays			
Greenwood	McInnis	Sherman			
Grijalva	McKeon	Sherwood			
Gutierrez	McNulty	Shimkus			
Gutknecht	Meehan	Shuster			
Hall	Meek (FL)	Simmons			
Harman	Meeks (NY)	Simpson			
Harris	Menendez	Skelton			
Hart	Mica	Slaughter			
Hastings (FL)	Michaud	Smith (MI)			
Hastings (WA)	Millender-	Smith (NJ)			
Hayes	McDonald	Smith (TX)			
Hayworth	Miller (MI)	Smith (WA)			
Hefley	Miller (NC)	Snyder			
Hensarling	Miller, Gary	Solis			
Herger	Miller, George	Souder			
Hinchey	Moore	Spratt			
Hinojosa	Moran (KS)	Strickland			
Hobson	Moran (VA)	Stupak			
Hoefel	Murphy	Sullivan			
Hoekstra	Musgrave	Sweeney			
Holden	Myrick	Tancred			
Holt	Nadler	Tanner			
Honda	Napolitano	Tauscher			
Hooley (OR)	Neal (MA)	Tauzin			
Hostettler	Nethercutt	Taylor (NC)			
Houghton	Neugebauer	Terry			
Hoyer	Ney	Thomas			
Hulshof	Northup	Thompson (MS)			
Hunter	Norwood	Thornberry			
Hyde	Nunes	Tiahrt			
Inslee	Nussle	Tiberti			
Isakson	Oberstar	Toomey			
Israel	Obey	Towns			
Issa	Olver	Turner (OH)			
Istook	Ortiz	Turner (TX)			
Jackson (IL)	Osborne	Udall (CO)			
Jackson-Lee	Ose	Udall (NM)			
(TX)	Otter	Upton			
Janklow	Owens	Van Hollen			
Jefferson	Oxley	Velazquez			
Jenkins	Pallone	Visclosky			
John	Pastor	Vitter			
Johnson (CT)	Paul	Walden (OR)			
Johnson (IL)	Payne	Walsh			
Johnson, E. B.	Pearce	Wamp			
Johnson, Sam	Pelosi	Waters			
Jones (NC)	Pence	Watson			
Jones (OH)	Peterson (MN)	Watt			
Kaptur	Peterson (PA)	Waxman			
Keller	Petri	Weiner			
Kelly	Pickering	Weldon (FL)			
Kennedy (MN)	Pitts	Weldon (PA)			
Kennedy (RI)	Pombo	Weller			
Kildee	Pomeroy	Wexler			
Kilpatrick	Porter				

the week. We will take any votes called for on the three pending motions to instruct next week.

Regarding next week's schedule, the House will convene on Tuesday at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. At that time we expect to consider several measures under suspension of the rules, and any votes called on those measures will be rolled until after 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday the House will meet for legislative business at 10 a.m. We expect to begin consideration of H.R. 2557, the Water Resources Development Act of 2003.

Members should also be aware that we may be considering conference reports at any time next week. We have a growing list of bills that could be ready. These include but are not limited to the fiscal year 2004 Homeland Security Appropriations Act, the fiscal 2004 Department of Defense Appropriations Act, and the Department of Defense authorization bill for fiscal 2004.

In addition, I would like to note that despite the great efforts of the House to complete all appropriations bills by the end of the fiscal year, we will have to consider a continuing resolution next week.

Finally, I would like to note for all Members that we do not plan to have votes next Friday, September 26.

Mr. Speaker, I thank gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

If I might, I would like to start with the general and then go to the specific for next week. I know that there are some of our colleagues who are trying to plan schedules for not only next week but weeks out and I know there has been a lot of discussion going on.

Can the leader tell me what he anticipates the schedule will be generally speaking in the month of October? My presumption is that we are going to be here through the end of October, as the Senate has not passed some of the bills and sent them to us. Our anticipation is that we will be here at least that long.

Can the gentleman tell us what he anticipates to be the schedule for the weeks of October? We know that the Senate is taking off one of those weeks. I think the first full week of October they will be taking off. I think Members would find it very useful if the gentleman could give us his thoughts on what our schedule would be.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

□ 1530

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do not want to prejudice the Committee on Appropriations' work, but I think in dealing with the Senate, the House and with both sides of the aisle it looks like everybody is coming together in a consensus around a continuing resolution that might run us to October 31, and that should be a very

#### NOT VOTING—13

Berry	Gephardt	Rush
Blumenauer	McIntyre	Stearns
Cubin	Miller (FL)	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Platts	
Forbes	Rohrabacher	

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1526

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas changed her vote from "nay" to "yea".

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker. I was not present for rollcall votes 506, 507, and 508, held earlier this afternoon on the Charitable Giving Act (H.R. 7). Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on the Cardin Substitute (No. 506). I would have voted "yes" on the Motion to Recommit (No. 507). I would have voted "yes" on Final Passage (No. 508).

#### AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO POSTPONE VOTES ON MOTIONS TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES CONSIDERED TODAY UNTIL TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2003

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to postpone further proceedings on any record vote ordered on the question of agreeing to a motion to instruct conferees considered today until Tuesday, September 23, 2003.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished majority leader, for the purposes of informing the House for the following week and perhaps thereafter.

Mr. DELAY. I appreciate the distinguished whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make all Members aware that the House has completed voting for the day and for

real signal to our Members that we will probably be in session to at least October 31.

However, trying to figure out exactly what weeks we will and will not work depends a lot on the work that we still have pending. Any day now we anticipate receiving from the administration a supplemental appropriations bill. Obviously, the Committee on Appropriations will go immediately to work on that, but I am informed that it may take at least two, three, even four weeks with hearings and things that need to be done, I think all Members want to really look at that supplemental and make sure that we are doing the right thing, and I cannot say today that, definitively, we would be off the week that the Senate has taken off, but I am hoping that working over the weekend and through the week next week, we ought to be able to give Members some sort of idea as to what the month of October might look like.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the leader's comments, and I understand when we get down towards the end of the session you are not sure exactly how the business will flow and you have got to make decisions as that occurs.

I understand the week of October 6, which is I guess a week and a half from today, I hate to try to pin the gentleman down, but Members obviously are trying to figure out when they get requests in their districts to do things, whether or not that October 6 date, again because the Senate's going to be off, is a probable time that they may be able to work in the District or whether it is too problematic for them to make any kinds of plans. I yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding. Let me just correct the gentleman. The week of October 6 is 2½ weeks from today, and I really believe that it is going to hinge on what the supplemental looks like and what the Committee on Appropriations thinks that their schedule might be in order to get the supplemental to the floor as quickly as possible, giving the Members every opportunity to look at the bill and participate in it.

My thinking is that if we can get that supplemental to the floor of the House by that week of October 6, we could very well be here voting on that supplemental.

Mr. HOYER. I understand. I thank the gentleman. Would it be fair for Members to presume, absent further notice, that we will be meeting, as we have been meeting, on the Tuesday evening, Thursday night schedule? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. As the gentleman knows, the House has been very active this year, and we have gotten a lot of our business done, and there is very important business left, but the requirement for floor time is getting less and less, and we do not

want to keep Members here any longer than they have to be. So, yes, we anticipate that the schedule would run at least Tuesday through Thursdays in the weeks ahead, but that could be adjusted, too.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. Now, if I could go to the specifics.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DELAY. I do not want Members to misunderstand me. Also, it is coming to the end of the session, and as the gentleman knows, I would not encourage Members to make a lot of plans for Mondays and Fridays, plans that cannot be broken because as we get to the end of the session, the weeks could very well get longer.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I understand what the leader is saying.

On the appropriations conference reports, the gentleman mentioned a number of conference reports, Homeland Security and DOD and the DOD authorization. Is there a possibility that the legislative branch appropriation conference report could come to the floor next week as well or any other conference reports?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would yield, the gentleman is correct. We are in conference on legislative branch, and we also are in conference on the military construction. Both of those could very well be ready for action next week. The appropriators are working hard, and it looks like they are doing their business once we get into conferences. So, yes, military construction and legislative branch could very well be up next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. The other conference report, there are many others, but one that we are very interested in is the labor-health-education conference report. Does the leader have any insight as to when that might be considered on the floor?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would yield, we certainly want to try to get moving on this most important piece of legislation as soon as possible. Unfortunately, the other body has trampled on the constitutional prerogatives of the House in initiating tax provisions in their bill.

The bill that the other body has passed has been blue-slipped appropriately by the Committee on Ways and Means, and until this blue-slip issue is resolved, I just cannot give the gentleman any sort of prediction as to when we would appoint conferees.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, is that on the issue of overtime pay for working Americans?

Mr. DELAY. No. If the gentleman would yield, my understanding is it is over the issue of raising Customs fees.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I understand. Reclaiming my time, there is another conference report that we have been talking about now for a couple of weeks, and that is the FAA conference report, the reauthorization, which the

authorization I think expires on September 30, if I am correct. Can the gentleman tell the body and the Members the status of that conference report?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would yield, the current FAA authorization, as the gentleman knows, expires at the end of this month, and obviously we need to keep that program going. The best way to do this would be to pass the FAA conference report, and we hope to find a way. We have been working very hard on it for the last 2 weeks. We still hope to find a way to do that conference report next week.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his observation on that, and we want to try to help him find a way, but as the gentleman knows, one of the provisions in that, which suggests privatizing the air traffic controllers, is a very controversial item I think on both sides of the aisle very frankly, but giving my colleague the information I think it is appropriate for him to have, I think beyond that and perhaps the training of the attendants, which we think is also very important for our homeland security and air traffic security purposes, but for those two I think we are pretty much in agreement.

So if we can facilitate perhaps on that which we are in agreement, moving the bill, we would be glad to try to help on that effort.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, the gentleman is absolutely correct, and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure are working very hard, and hopefully, we will have a resolution by next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

There is another bill, as we all know, that the authorization of which is expiring the end of this month, and that is the Transportation Efficiency Act 21. TEA-21, as we refer to it, is expiring. That has been in consideration. I know there is a lot of controversy about how much investment ought to be authorized in that bill. Can the gentleman tell us the status of that particular piece of legislation, which is so critical to the welfare of our country? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

It is my understanding that two bills were introduced today extending the funding for transportation infrastructure for the next 5 months in one bill and 6 months in another bill. We hope to have one of those bills to the floor by next week. The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is working very hard to prepare that bill for floor consideration, and the gentleman is absolutely right. It is critical to keep highway funding flowing, particularly going into the winter season. We want to get as much construction finished in the northern States now before the winter completes, and there are a lot of contracts of construction out there right now.

So it is vitally important for us to extend the highway program while we are working on a more comprehensive 6-year highway bill.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, so the gentleman thinks that may be on the floor next week?

Mr. DELAY. We are working hard to get it to the floor next week because we only have, starting off next week, I think we have 10 days before the end of this fiscal year.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, next to last issue I would bring up, I think I heard the gentleman say this, but I want to make sure the Members understand, is it the gentleman's understanding, and is it his intention, that if we adopt a CR, is it next week that he thinks we may do that, that the date set in that CR for continuing funding would be until the 31st of October? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

While I heard there is growing support for a CR that carries us through to October 31, to my knowledge no final decisions have been made on that, but a decision on it is getting closer and closer.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, last question, and I know it would disappoint my colleague if I did not pursue this issue, but Senator GRASSLEY in the other body was quoted as saying he expects the Democrats to keep the heat on on this issue, so we do not want to disappoint him either.

I say that facetiously, but we really do care about the child tax credit. It appears that the conference is meeting. It appears that there is significant disagreement between the House and the Senate, but there appears that there is, in this limited area, that is, extending the child tax credit to those families who are making between \$10- and \$26,000, of which there are some 6½ million families, 12 million children affected by this and 200,000 military families, there appears to be agreement on this issue.

One of the disagreements is apparently that there are some of us who are willing to make it permanent, but want to at least see it active this year, but one of the problems apparently that the gentleman expressed last week was if we cannot make it permanent, we apparently cannot do it. I would hope, because I think we could do it very quickly on this floor and would not take much time of the body, that the gentleman would bring to the floor the Senate bill, which has the child tax credit, and that we might pass that or, alternatively, simply do a limited bill, send it to the Senate, and they could take it off the desk and pass it, but in either event, it would facilitate getting to those 6½ million families the same kind of assistance that we have already given to others who have received a refund of the child tax credit. I know the gentleman anticipated that question. I know he has an answer.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I have enjoyed my time in this institution working with the gentleman on institution matters, and I know the gentleman has strongly-held beliefs of protecting the prerogatives of this institution and the will of the House, and I just say to the gentleman under this issue, his words "extending the child tax credit" are critical. This House has spoken on that issue. This House has considered the Senate bill he mentions. This House has rejected that Senate bill as flawed, and this House has expressed itself because it wants to extend the child tax credit beyond the next election, and we expressed it in passing with a very good vote a bill and sent it to the other body.

I just would recommend that the gentleman direct his comments and his strategy toward the other body. All they have to do is pick up the House bill and the gentleman will get everything that he has asked for.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I understand what the gentleman said, but when one really addresses this issue in a way that reflects I think an honest analysis of it, there is disagreement between the two bodies on the proposal we made in the House and the proposal that has been made in the Senate. There is, however, no disagreement, not a scintilla of difference, between the two houses on whether or not assistance ought to be given to these 6½ million people, families and 12 million children, 200,000 military families this year. The only issue is do we want to do it further and keep it. Very frankly, I would want to do it at least this year, and then I will fight to do it next year and the year after, and our side of the aisle will fight side by side with the gentleman trying to make that permanent, but because there is no disagreement on that issue but there is disagreement, as the gentleman points out, between our body and the other body on other issues included in the bill to which the gentleman refers, these 6½ million families are paying the price.

What I am saying respectfully to the leader is that on the issue that I have brought up, there is no disagreement, as I understand it, with Republicans, with Democrats in the House or with Republicans or Democrats in the Senate, and because we have agreement on that, we ought to act, and I would urge the majority leader to seriously consider requesting that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and we ought to protect our jurisdiction, we ought to initiate that bill but because we have agreement, I would hope we would do so. I would yield.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I would just mention to the gentleman we do have a disagreement. The gentleman is correct. Everyone in this House wants to accelerate the child tax credit that is already on its way for the 6½ million families. The disagreement in this

House is on my colleague's side. They would like to allow that to expire, and these 6½ million families would have their taxes increased the following year. We think that is a horrible policy, and we would like to, if they get this tax break, that they can count on this tax break for more than 1 year. This tax credit. It is not a tax break. This tax credit for more than a year.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time if that, as the gentleman posits, is the disagreement, then I would say to the leader that I think I can in the next 96 hours get my side of the aisle to agree with his side of the aisle to pass that as a permanent extension. The problem we have is not between our bodies on that issue as I said. I think my party would join. These are folks who make between \$10- and \$26,000 who are trying to support their children, put them into school, get them through and make them good citizens. We want to help that, my colleague wants to help that, but we are not doing it. We are not doing it because there is a disagreement between the two bodies.

I think it is incorrect to characterize our side of the aisle as wanting this to expire. What we want to do is pass, and if there is disagreement between the bodies, we at least want to take one step, even if we cannot take five steps, because that one step will help those families. I would be glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

□ 1545

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I simply would like to say at this moment we have seen the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority whip in their first year in these important positions go through an exchange of issues on which there was quite a bit of agreement and the most recent one some disagreement.

I would like to point out to my colleagues that 216 years ago today, the framers signed the U.S. Constitution and began that laborious task of ensuring its ratification. And to hear the distinguished majority leader talk about exercising our constitutional prerogatives as the first branch of government is very inspiring to me, and I know will continue to inspire all of those who have worked so hard to ensure the success of this, the greatest deliberative body known to man.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want the gentleman to know as the representative of the original adopters of that extraordinary document who were then later pleased to welcome to our ranks those who serve under that Constitution our distinguished citizens from Texas and distinguished citizens that California. And I had the opportunity of hearing the majority leader speak today at a ceremony at the National Archives at

which we unveiled the newly ensconced and protected charters of freedom, the Constitution of the United States preceded by the Declaration of Independence and followed closely by the Bill of Rights, those three extraordinary documents which stand as probably the most powerful statements of a free people and of liberty and justice and a government of laws and not of men. They will be preserved from the elements as they have been preserved from those who would undermine their principles and their reality.

I want to congratulate the leader for his comments today at that ceremony.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I know I speak on behalf of my colleague from Texas when I say we both appreciate that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) welcomed us into the Union.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The Chair reminds Members it is inappropriate for Members of the House to characterize the actions of the Senate in their remarks.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2557, WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2003

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules may meet next week, the week of September 22, to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 2557, the Water Resources Development Act of 2003. The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure ordered the bill reported on July 23, 2003, and filed its report with the House on September 5, 2003.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules up in room 312 here in the Capitol by 1 p.m. by Tuesday, September 23. Members should draft their amendments to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, Members are reminded that earlier in the year the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure set forth a specific process regarding the submission of projects for inclusion in the Water Resources Development Act. The Committee on Rules does not intend to accord priority to amendments that have not gone through the aforementioned process.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the appropriate format. Members are also

advised to check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 367

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 367.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1078

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1078.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1308, TAX RELIEF, SIMPLIFICATION, AND EQUITY ACT OF 2003

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RYAN of Ohio moves that the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1308 be instructed as follows:

1. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment (not included in the House amendment) that provides immediate payments to taxpayers receiving an additional credit by reason of the bill in the same manner as other taxpayers were entitled to immediate payments under the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003.

2. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment (not included in the House amendment) that provides families of military personnel serving in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other combat zones a child credit based on the earnings of the individuals serving in the combat zone.

3. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report all of the other provisions of the Senate amendment and shall not report back a conference report that includes additional tax benefits not offset by other provisions.

4. To the maximum extent possible within the scope of conference, the House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report other tax benefits for military personnel and the families of the astronauts who died in the Columbia disaster.

5. The House conferees shall, as soon as practicable after the adoption of this motion, meet in open session with the Senate conferees and the House conferees shall file a conference report consistent with the preceding provisions of this instruction, not later than the second legislative day after adoption of this motion.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous

consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and a member of the opposing party each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today I am offering a motion to instruct conferees on the child tax credit. I thank all Members of Congress, especially the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), for initially offering her leadership on this motion.

Mr. Speaker, the tax bill that was passed by Congress neglected 12 million children in America's low-income working families by cutting them out of the child tax credit plan.

My motion to instruct does a few things. It instructs the conferees to agree to the Senate language that provides for tax credit checks to be mailed immediately to low-income families. It also provides that the tax credit be extended to personnel in combat zones in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere; and the conferees could easily accomplish these changes and bring up a final bill within 2 days which is what the motion calls for.

In Ohio, the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight states that over 25,000 working families were cut out of this provision. These are families who work hard. They do pay taxes. Unlike what many Members have said during the debate in the last few months, these individuals may not pay income tax, but they pay property tax, sales tax, they pay user fees, they pay tolls to get on the roads; and so they do contribute to the economy. They do pay taxes.

I was having an interesting conversation with a Republican friend who was listening to this debate happen because this is not the first time we have had this debate in the Chamber, and he said they do not pay taxes. I said they do pay taxes. They pay sales tax and property tax. He said give them a rebate on their property tax. My question to him is what is the difference?

Mr. Speaker, these people need help, and we have not done enough for them in this Chamber. We have an opportunity with this bill to make and have real impact on low-income families.

One last example that this bill, this motion, would help those military families that we talk so much about. One example that we have, an E-5 or E-6 sergeant, 6 years of service, two children, making \$29,000 a year. If he does not serve in combat, both of his children qualify for the credit. They get the thousand-dollar credit. If he is in combat for 6 months, his or her credit drops to \$450. I do not think there is a